is very unlikely to insure vessels that would run afoul of a quarantine of gasoline. And if the insurers will not insure the cargo, the cargo does not flow. If the cargo does not flow, you do not need a naval quarantine. Frankly, the economics work in that advantage.

Secondly, this is a recognition that we want to share in the success of our European friends. They deserve credit for bringing us to a point where the Iranians are at least taking the position that they want to suspend this program. They deserve credit for saying they are ready to go to the Security Council, our British and French and German friends, should that need become evident. So this is an extension of a friendship with our allies in Western Europe, and it is a way to build on the success that they have had without resorting to armed conflict but by using the creative, economic and diplomatic tools at our disposal.

Finally, I would say spiritually, I do not doubt that someday, my daughters are 12 and 10, Jackie and Josie, and I think someday they will go to Iran. I want them to go to Iran as exchange students or as performers or as athletes or as people to visit friends that they have met in college or graduate school. I do not want them to go there as soldiers. We cannot ignore the reality that a jihadist despotic regime is trying to get a nuclear weapon, and we cannot ignore the high probability they will use it in ways that will terrify the world. But understanding of that threat does not imply a rush to military action. Instead, it implies a thoughtful, constructive plan such as the gentleman from Illinois has laid out.

It is our intention to introduce a resolution that lays out the ideas behind the gentleman from Illinois' discussion tonight. We want to persuade both Democratic and Republican colleagues and the administration to be supportive of this idea. We want to show that it is a reflection of our partnership with our Western European allies. And we want it to succeed. It is my hope that it is never necessary, that the mere fact that this is being discussed will embolden progressive, freedom-loving Iranians to take matters into their own hands. But I think it is going to take more than that. And I think that the idea the gentleman from Illinois has sketched out is one that will work. It is pragmatic, it represents our best tools and values, and I look forward to supporting it.

Mr. KIRK. I thank the gentleman and look forward to working with him and advancing this. We will be introducing our resolution next week.

ANNOUNCING INTRODUCTION OF THE NEW APOLLO ENERGY PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for half of the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight both to talk about a serious challenge of our country and some very optimistic news in that challenge. The challenge is to adopt an energy policy that will really be up to the problems we today face; and the optimistic news is that tomorrow with 15 of my colleagues, I will introduce the New Apollo Energy Project. The New Apollo Energy Project is a project that will really create a vision for this country's energy future that is up to the technological prowess of this country, that recognizes our can-do spirit, that recognizes the three challenges that I will talk about tonight, and will step up to the plate and solve those challenges. And it is about time for the New Apollo Energy Project because, indeed, we have challenges.

The New Apollo Energy Project of the bill we will introduce tomorrow will face three distinct challenges that we have in this country. It will face them head-on, and it will solve them. The first challenge that we face is somewhat related to the problems in the Mideast, the oil-producing region of the world that my colleagues were just talking about for the last hour. We know on a bipartisan basis that it is unhealthy for our personal national security; it is unhealthy for our ability to advance the cause of democracy, to be addicted to oil from the Mideast. It is unhealthy for any party who is in control of the White House. It is unhealthy for us across this country to have to make judgments about our foreign policy based on the politics, for instance, of the Saudi royal house.

Our addiction to Middle Eastern oil has cost this country dearly, and we must break that addiction. As I will talk about later, there is one way to do it and that is to adopt new technological fixes to wean ourselves off of oil so that this country can experience a new burst of democracy and spread it around the world, not afflicted and shackled to this pernicious addiction to Middle Eastern oil. The New Apollo Energy Project, I am happy to say, we will introduce it tomorrow, and it will take, I believe, the strongest, boldest, most ambitious step that this Congress has seen to try to deal with that problem.

The second problem: we are losing manufacturing jobs in this country by the thousands. We had a 14 percent reduction in manufacturing just in the last several years, since this last President took office. That is unconscionable. We need to adopt a new high-tech, new energy vision in this country that will make sure that the jobs associated with the efficient use of energy and the new production of energy are grown here in the United States. It is a sad commentary that the most fuel-efficient cars now are being built in Japan. The jobs of the future, building fuel-efficient cars, need to be in the United States of America. Those jobs need to be here.

□ 2230

Why are the jobs associated with the production of wind turbine technology which is actually the fastest-growing energy source in the United States, why are those jobs going to Denmark? Those jobs ought to be here. Why are the jobs associated with the solar cell industry going to Germany? Those jobs need to be in the United States.

The New Apollo Energy Project will seize on the basic can-do spirit of America to grow our homegrown technologies to bring those high-tech jobs and manufacturing jobs and construction jobs. We need to lay a lot of steel and copper to wire this country for the new sources of technologies that we need. Those jobs need to be in the United States of America. As I will talk about in a little more detail, the New Apollo Energy project will address that problem by growing over 3 million jobs in the next 6 years in this country associated with these new energy resources and efficiency systems.

So, first, we have a security concern. Second, we have a jobs concern. And the third concern is a global one, and that is the challenge of global warming. As we know from the National Academy of Sciences today, which came out with another report, another nail in the coffin of those who urged to take no action based on global warming, it is a fact. Arguing it would be like arguing gravity at this point. There are uncertainties of how significant it will be, but we need to step up to the plate and address global warming, and the New Apollo Energy Project is the most ambitious bill that has ever been introduced in this House to deal with that issue in ways that we will address.

So this New Apollo Energy Project will address three problems: A security problem associated with our addiction to Middle Eastern oil; a jobs problem associated with the loss of jobs going overseas due to other countries being advanced and getting ahead of us in this game; and, third, the need for our Nation to stop global warming. Rarely do we have a trifecta in one bill that will address three separate issues. But this needs to be done.

The reason we define our bill as the New Apollo Energy Project is it draws some inspiration from John Kennedy, who stood behind me here May 9, 1961, and said that America was going to put a man on the Moon in 10 years and bring him back safely. When he challenged America to do that, it was a very audacious, bold challenge. We had not even invented Tang yet. Rockets were blowing up on the launch pad. Many thought Kennedy had really engaged in a hallucinatory plan. But Kennedy recognized something that we should now recognize, which is that Americans, when they are challenged to invent new responses to problems we have, Americans come through.

In my district, we understand the power of innovation. Boeing Company, I represent the area north of Seattle,

where we are going to build the most fuel-efficient jet in the world, the Boeing 787. It is going to have 20 percent more fuel efficiency. It is going to be one of the most comfortable jets ever. I am looking forward to riding in it. That is the power of innovation.

My district includes the Microsoft campus. We understand the power of innovation. America has the greatest innovators the world has ever seen, and now it is time to harken back to the Kennedy spirit of putting a man on the Moon, to say we need to adopt a new energy policy that is equally ambitious and equally optimistic, and this is a very optimistic plan.

If I can, I would like to say that we have good news, too. We are developing a more bipartisan, I think, and across the ideological spectrum viewpoint that we have to deal with these issues: security, jobs, and global climate change.

I want to address the security issue. I happen to be a Democrat, but this is not just a Democratic issue. I am very interested in a letter sent to President George Bush on May 24, 2005, signed by a whole host of past Cabinet officers in Republican administrations and Democratic administrations, people who have been involved in the security challenges of the United States: Robert McFarland; James Woolsey, former official in the Bush and Clinton administrations, former chief of the CIA; C. Boyden Gray, former chief of the Agency in the Bush administration; Admiral William Crowe, U.S. Navy retired; Honorable David Oliver, former Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense. A whole score of folks involved in the defense of the security of this Nation.

Basically, their message to President Bush was simple, that we have to develop alternatives to oil and that our addiction to oil presents a security risk to the United States. They said very pointedly, I thought, that with only 2 percent of the world's oil reserves but 25 percent of the current world consumption, the United States cannot, cannot, eliminate its need for its imports through increased domestic production alone. They understand that the dinosaurs went to die somewhere else, mostly in the Mid East, and we need to develop alternatives to oil.

They went on to urge the President to adopt improved efficiencies and rapid deployment and development of advanced biomass, alcohol, and other available petroleum alternatives. They said that action to prepare for the day that when we need to wean ourselves from oil will pay dividends for our national security, our international competitiveness, and our future prosperity.

They made some really specific proposals, these security experts. They said that we should make it a national top security priority to significantly reduce our consumption of foreign oil through improved efficiency and the rapid substitution of advanced biomass, alcohol, and other available alternative fuels; and this effort should be funded at a level proportionate with other priorities for the defense our Nation. They look at this as a defense issue, as does our New Apollo Energy Project. They said the Federal Government should consider mandating substantial incorporation of hybrids, plug-in hybrids, and flexible fuel vehicles into Federal, State, municipal, and other government fleets.

The New Apollo Energy Project that we will introduce tomorrow does these things and much more because it recognizes the security threat to the United States that these security officials recognize and it takes action today.

Now I would like to, if I can, talk about the threat of global warming. That is one of the reasons we need to take action associated with the New Apollo Energy Project. There are some very interesting things that happened this week on the front of new energy. The National Academy of Sciences essentially yesterday came out with a report which concluded, as have the International Panel of Sciences previously studying this effort, that the earth is warming. A substantial portion of that is caused by human activity, that warming will occur even if we stop today because the carbon dioxide that causes global warming stays in the atmosphere for decades, and called for action now, not 10 years from now, to deal with this threat. This is the National Academy of Sciences, one of the most nonpartisan, prestigious groups in America. It joined other academies across the world actually yesterday in issuing this manifesto.

The reason they are saying that is quite clear. Global warming is a well-understood principle. Energy light, an ultraviolet spectrum can come through the atmosphere. When it bounces back, it is in the infrared spectrum. Unfortunately, in part, carbon dioxide traps infrared energy and does not allow it to radiate back to space.

Actually, it is a wonderful thing. If it was not for this aspect, we would have a frozen planet on our hands. But the fact of the matter is too much carbon dioxide causes global warming. We know that is happening. As the Academy of Sciences said today, we know it is happening through melting glaciers, changes in biological standards up and down the coastline, melting tundra in the Arctic, the disappearance. Glacier National Park will not have glaciers in 75 years at this rate due to global warming.

So how do we know this is occurring? If I can refer to a couple of charts here, we see with our own eyes some changes, and I will get to the theory of why this is happening. But we have seen with our own eyes some very substantial changes in our world as a result of global warming already.

This is a picture of the ice sheet in the Antarctic. And if I can refer to the glacier, it is the Pine Island Glacier as it comes down into the sea. It shows pictures on September 16, 2000; November 4, 2001; November 12, 2001. It shows a breakup of the ice coming down into the Antarctic. This piece of ice here is roughly 26 miles long and 11 miles wide. That is a substantial piece of the Antarctic breaking off, and this phenomenon we have now seen in substantial places across the Antarctic.

Now, obviously, one piece of ice does not the puzzle make, but what we are seeing now is these things with our own eyes. This is not a hypothetical issue.

If one travels to the Glacier National Park, they may say, where did the glaciers go? They melted. If they travel to Alaska and they see some buckled housing, it is because the tundra is melting. If one goes to Denali National Park and ask why trees have moved up, it is because the weather is getting warmer. We see this with our own eyes. The reason this has happened is because of carbon dioxide.

I actually stumbled across a pretty amazing chart today, disturbing and amazing. What this chart shows is the carbon dioxide and temperature levels going back from today, which starts here at zero, going backwards 400,000 years. So, basically, this chart shows carbon dioxide and temperature levels over the last 400,000 years.

Scientists know this because they find trapped particles of air, air bubbles essentially in glacier ice going back during that period; and they can analyze the air to determine both the carbon dioxide in these bubbles when they were trapped 400,000 years ago and the temperature by looking at the isotopes of oxygen and the concentration of trace materials. So we have a very good unarguable, all the scientists agree on this, record of what the earth has done.

There are three salient things from this record.

Number one, we see that there is a very close correlation between deviations in carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and global temperatures. The CO_2 levels as shown in the red line, we will see deviations over the last 400,000 years up and down. These are parts per million from about 180 at the bottom to 380 at the top of this yellow section.

So what we see is carbon dioxide levels have gone up and down, in some cycles, over the last 400,000 years. But it is pretty interesting because the temperatures, if the Members notice the blue line, pretty much follow in a regular path the red line. And what we see is that temperatures have followed changes in carbon dioxide levels. It is a very close correlation, as we are seeing now. Because what we are seeing now is an explosion of carbon dioxide. It is sort of human-caused volcanic of carbon dioxide which is sending CO_2 levels through the roof.

The second thing that was interesting in this chart is that when we come to today, which is this spot right here on this graph, this red line shows CO_2 levels, and it shows the CO_2 levels

that are expected by the scientists as a result of our burning fossil fuels, putting CO_2 into the atmosphere. And what it shows is today we are at about 375 parts per million. For every million molecules, there are about 375 molecules of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. That is higher today than at any time in the last 400,000 years on earth. Anytime in the last 400,000 years, we have more CO_2 in the atmosphere than we have ever had in the last 400,000 years, and it is getting hotter rapidly. Ten of the last hottest years we have had in the last decade. Temperatures are rising.

But what is disturbing is that the scientists are projecting CO_2 levels to continue to go up essentially on a vertical line looked at geological time. By 2050, we are expected to have 550 parts per million. Our CO_2 will be up here, almost twice the highest level ever in the last 400,000 years of unrecorded history. That is under a business as usual if things go well.

Now, there is uncertainty in this. We do not know exactly what is going to happen. If things go well, the optimistic assumption, if we do business as usual, is by 2050, my children's lifetime, we will have 550 parts per million, almost double the carbon dioxide we had then. By 2100, my grandkids' lifetime, we will have 980 parts per million, almost three times as much carbon dioxide in the atmosphere than has ever been in global history as far as we can tell. It is disturbing when we see what has happened already in our world to think of this curve exploding in this nature.

□ 2245

That is why the National Academy of Sciences is calling for action today.

That is the good news. We have some scientists who want us to act. The bad news is the Bush administration refuses to do so. In fact, we read in today's New York Times that the chief of staff of the Department of Environmental Quality for the administration actually cooked the books and edited reports to change them to make it look like this is not such a big deal. That is very disturbing when you look at the real science that the National Academy of Sciences has projected.

Well, those are the challenges we have. The fact of the matter is, we can take action on this. We can take action now, starting tomorrow with the New Apollo Energy Project.

Basically, the New Apollo Energy Project is going to take a multiple approach to this. It recognizes that there is no silver bullet to this issue. There are many things that we all need to do and industry needs to help in to solve these multiple energy policies.

But one thing it does not do, it does not do like the energy bill did that passed this House, that gave 94 percent of all the taxpayer dollars to the oil and gas industry, one of the largest obscene subsidies, using taxpayer money to subsidize one of the wealthiest industries in American history already. It does not do that. It does not take the money out of taxpayer dollars and give it to the likes of Exxon, who last quarter had $7.5 billion profits. Why do they need subsidies when fuel is at $55 a barrel already? It does not do that. It uses a host of approaches to deal with this issue.

Now, one of the first things it does is it does what you would do if you want to reduce your energy consumption. The first thing is we stop wasting energy. The best way to create energy is not to waste it, not to throw it away. Unfortunately, because of some industrial policies that have not used efficiency, we are not using our heads when it comes to being efficient in use of energy. Let me show you one of the most discouraging things when you look at our national policy of some years.

This is a chart of the fuel economy, fleet fuel economy, both truck and car, from 1975 to 2005. I think it is one of the most troublesome graphs I have seen, because it shows a real failure by this U.S. Congress and, frankly, by some folks in deciding what cars and trucks to make for us.

What it shows is in 1975, this middle line basically is the average fuel mileage that a combination of our cars and trucks got. In 1975 we were getting a combination of about 14 miles per gallon, back in 1975. In 1975 we made a conscious decision to demand that our auto industry produce more fuel efficient vehicles, and they did. They were supremely successful in responding to that congressional mandate.

They almost, well, not doubled, but went up at least 65 percent, up to about 1984, when our fuel economy got up to about 22 miles per gallon combined. So we went from about 14 miles a gallon to 22 miles a gallon in less than a decade. A pretty good achievement, because we put our minds to it. We used our design capability, we advanced safer, roomier, more comfortable, more fuel efficient cars, and we did it because we used our brains. People designed and built cars that did that because we demanded through the U.S. Congress that that happen through something we called the corporate average fuel economy standards.

Then in 1985 the government basically fell off the wagon. They stopped making any more requests for further fuel efficiency, and our fuel efficiency since that time has actually gone down since 1985. So today the industry as a group provides us vehicles that get less gas mileage than our vehicles did in 1985.

Now, think about that. Since 1985 we have invented the entire Internet, we have perfected space travel, we have mapped the human genome, we have got cell phones for our kids coming out our ears, but the cars we drive get less fuel mileage than they did in 1985. That is a failure, and we need to do something about that.

We need to put our heads together, and the New Apollo Energy Project in part takes a small step. It does not specifically increase the standards, but it suggests we do research, we do research in finding how to have more fuel efficient cars in a whole host of ways, just like these national security experts suggested that we do.

It was pointed out to me by the architect of this plan, if we had simply continued this rate of improvement to 2005, if we had not stopped in 1985, we would be free of imported oil today from Saudi Arabia. Think how that would be a better situation.

So the first thing we do is we do not waste fuel. We do not waste energy in our buildings, and our new Apollo Energy Project has new building research and standards to try to encourage industry to provide us more fuel efficient buildings, one of which is to have the U.S. Government adopt more advanced standards for building Federal buildings. That is just a start.

States are doing this around the country. My State, the State of Washington, just adopted the most progressive efficiency standard for public buildings, and we ought to do the same. And we do this in the New Apollo Energy Project so we do not waste.

We do this in a variety of ways. We give consumers incentives. We give advanced tax breaks. If you buy a fuel efficient car, we give a tax break, unlike the House bill that passed here a few weeks ago. It gives producers incentives.

We want to save the domestic auto industry in the United States. It is in deep, deep trouble and we want to save it. There are two ways. Number one, we give it substantial assistance to get back on its feet through use of in some of its retooling expenditures and its tax treatment, and in a way I hope we will also assume some of the health care costs ultimately, the legacy costs of our domestic auto industry.

But that is not all we have to do to save the domestic auto industry. We also have to grab back the market share we are losing to the Japanese and soon the Chinese in fuel efficient cars. We take steps in that direction.

Third, we take some regulatory approaches. We realize there are certain things we simply have to do to get this genie back in the bottle. One of the things we have to do is limit the amount of carbon dioxide we are putting into the atmosphere. We do that by incorporating the standards over in the Senate. Senators MCCAIN and LIEBERMAN are leading an effort to establish a cap on the amount of carbon dioxide that goes into the air. We do this now for nitrogen and for sulfur. It is time to do it for carbon dioxide. We have learned that that gas, that toxic material, that pollutant, could cause us more problems than all of these put together.

We have been very effective. This is one of the real success stories in what we have done to clean up our air. We have cleaned it up of nitrogen, for sulfur to a significant degree. If the administration does not roll back our

mercury standards we hope to increase our safety for our kids from mercury. But we have not done it for carbon dioxide. That is the granddaddy of it all when it comes to changing our entire climatic system. So we need to add that pollutant to the list we control.

We know this works. We do a cap and trade system and we force polluting industries to bid, if you will, so we have the most efficient way to bring efficiencies to our production and manufacturing systems. Then we use the money generated from that auction to pay for the research and application of these fuel efficiency standards.

By the way, this is one of the great virtues of the New Apollo Energy Project. It is paid for. We have a $600 billion in real terms deficit, and we need to pay for things, and this is paid for.

We have provided a mechanism for paying for every penny of expenditures in the New Apollo Energy Project through two means: Number one, this auction of permits to put carbon dioxide in the air, which will generate billions of dollars; and, secondly, by closing a couple of corporate tax loopholes that allow corporations to move jobs offshore and then get tax breaks for doing that. On a bipartisan basis we ought to close some of those. So we pay for this bill, it is fiscally responsible, and I think that is important to do.

Now, why do we have optimism this is going to work? Well, for one reason, it is working. Let me tell you about some successes we are having in that regard.

First off, it should be noted this is not pie-in-the-sky by any means. I will just show you a picture and note a couple successes. This is a picture of the Hathaways' home in Loudoun County, Virginia. They built this home for about $365,000, which is in the realm of building costs here, not too different from houses of this nature.

When they built this home, they wanted to incorporate state-of-the-art technologies to try to reduce their energy usage. They built a home that did just that. They built a home that incorporates solar cell technology in the roof, some passive solar heating in the way they designed the home and oriented it, an in-ground heat pump, which is extremely efficient. This in-ground heat pump is just amazingly efficient. They used additional insulation and a few other whiz-bang items to try to reduce their energy consumption.

What they did is they produced, and I cannot recall the exact square footage, but you can see it is a pretty good-sized home, it looks nice, they produced a home that is attractive, comfortable and uses zero net energy off the grid, because they produce energy.

First off, they use it efficiently, and they produce energy through their solar roof system and their net consumption is zero. The way they can make it zero is while they are producing more energy than they are using, which happens frequently, they are feeding energy back into the grid, so their meter on the side of the home runs backwards a good part of the time when they sell back to the energy utility the energy they are generating. When you net the two out, they have a zero consumption. This is today, within about 60 miles of where I am standing, and it is working today.

But it is not just solar and those techniques. The good news is that our investments in these technologies over the last several decades are paying off big time, as they say. If you look at all of these new technologies, you find a very consistent dynamic, and that dynamic is that the more we build, the cheaper it becomes.

Right now in wind power we are building the largest wind turbine farm in North America in the southeast corner of Washington State. Some farmers are going to do pretty well in the leases associated with these wind farms.

These wind farms 20 years ago would have been very expensive. They started about 20 years ago and the electricity produced from them was much more expensive than gas or coal. As we developed the technology and produced more turbines, the cost has come down. Now in Washington State the cost of wind power is just about market-based with the cost of alternative fuel of gas turbines that you would have to produce to provide an alternative. In fact, I just saw some plans, one of our utilities is going to have 5 percent in the next decade of their energy produced through wind.

This is a real functioning system. If you look at what has happened at the cost, in 1980, the cost was about 35 cents per kilowatt hour. That has come down to by 2000 to about 3, 4, 5 cents, depending where you are, this incredible reduction just in the last two decades. That a combination of new technology and the scales of production as you ramp up.

What we find as we start to implement these things is they become much less costly. That is why a lot of people who sort have been naysayers of new technology say it will cost too much. Of course it will. The first time you build something it usually costs quite a bit. Look at our defense array. Guess how much the first laser beam we built cost for the Defense Department?

The same thing in solar cell. PV is photovoltaic. We see it cost about 100 cents per kilowatt hour in 1980. That has come down to 21–23 cents in the year 2000, and that curve is going to continue.

The same for biomass, which we are very excited about. We have a plant going in we hope in Monroe, Washington, shortly for biomass.

I met about a month ago with farmers in Eastern Washington who want to start an industry around mustard and grape seed to develop oils to fuel our cars and heat our homes. You look at biomass, 1980 again about 12 cents per kilowatt hour. That is down to about 7 cents now, and that line is projected to continue down. The same with geothermal and the same with solar thermal, basically just heating water on top of our roofs, which is very efficient as well.

□ 2300

So the good news is that as we focus on these energy systems they become much more efficient and thereby less expensive. So this is one reason that we have a sense of optimism in that regard.

Now I want to come back to, if I can just for a moment, to the certainty both of the reasons for optimism and the certainty for the need for action here. We know that we are the best innovators in the world, and we know we are people of science. And the science has shown that science works, and that is why these costs are coming down. The science has also shown the necessity for action.

I do want to refer to this report that was just issued by the National Academies of Science yesterday. It says that there is now strong evidence that significant global warming is occurring. The evidence comes from direct measurements of rising surface air temperatures and subsurface ocean temperatures and from phenomena such as increases in average global sea levels, retreating glaciers, and changes to many physical and biological systems.

Here is a pivotal statement. It is likely that most of the warming in recent decades can be attributed to human activities. This warming has already led to changes in the earth's climate. The scientific understanding of climate change is now sufficiently clear to justify nations taking prompt action. Even if greenhouse gas emissions were stabilized instantly at today's levels, the climate would still continue to change and adapt to the increased emission of recent decades.

It went on to talk about the negative ramifications of climate change, increases in the frequency and severity of weather events such as heat waves and heavy rainfall. Increasing temperatures could lead to large-scale effects such as melting of large ice sheets, a major impact on low-lying regions in the world. At the level that the sea is predicted to rise, which is .1 to .9 meters, in Bangladesh alone 6 million people would be at risk for flooding.

Science tells us that we need to act, and there is no excuse, no excuse whatsoever for this administration to dig in its heels and refuse to act.

The President, it is interesting, because I have heard him say both publicly and to me personally that he realizes that this is an issue that he has to address. Yet he has refused to lift a finger to limit carbon dioxide emissions. He has refused to lift a finger to address the rest of the world, to try to engage the rest of the world in dealing with this issue. He has refused to lift a

finger to stop this Chamber from adopting an oil-soaked policy that might make former friends in the oil and gas industry rich but will impoverish the taxpayer directly through their taxes and our grandchildren through its climate.

This is inexcusable. Anyone with any respect, any decent shred of respect for the whole nature of scientific inquiry who willfully blinds themselves to this great threat, to this beautiful little blue globe we live on, cannot be said to be acting as a steward of the Creator's Earth. We are stewards of this Earth for future generations. It is our primary reason for living, and this administration is woefully inadequate in its discharge of that responsibility.

That is why I am pleased that myself and others tomorrow will introduce a bill that will get this great Nation engaged in using its talents to solve this problem. Because a country that did put a man on the Moon, who responded to John F. Kennedy's challenge in the 1960s, is equally able to respond to the challenge of energies in this century and much more so. Because we have seen, we have witnessed firsthand the incredible powers of this country when we challenge ourselves to use our technological prowess to invent our way out of the pickle which we are in now.

So I am happy that we are going to use not just one technology here, and it is not just solar and it is not just wind. We should do research, and my bill will call for research, in clean coal technology. If we can find a way to burn coal and not put carbon dioxide in the air, we should do so.

There are significant challenges in that: Where we will store the carbon dioxide if we cannot separate it from the gas stream? Those are big challenges, but we need to do the research, and we should not be blinded from those potential solutions as well.

It has to do with simple things like using management of our transportation systems to try to reduce our costs. It is by maximizing some of our public transportation systems. It is like some of even our zoning requirements to try to reduce the number of miles we have to drive to get to work. And, fortunately, with the Internet explosion, we are finding ways to reduce some of those, some of those expenses as well.

The point is that we have to let a thousand flowers bloom when it comes to energy, and our bill will do so by encouraging a whole raft of new research projects from soup to nuts on dealing with this issue.

I am very pleased to say that this bill will be introduced tomorrow, and I would encourage my colleagues to take a good look at this. Because we are all, all in this together, and this should not be a partisan bill. We see good leadership from John McCain on this over in the Senate and others. We see leaders in renewable technology on the Republican side of the aisle here in the House. And we are hoping as time goes on we will adopt a bipartisan vision along the way of the new Apollo Energy Project. America deserves it. We are up to it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MENENDEZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 4:00 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of his daughter's graduation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today and June 9.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOODE, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 9, 2005, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2243. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to Section 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with section 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313, a report prepared by the Department of State and the National Security Council on the progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period February 1, 2005 through March 31, 2005; to the Committee on International Relations.

2244. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2245. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2246. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2247. A letter from the Acting Chief Financial Officer, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting the Bank's Annual Management Report for the fiscal year ended September 30,2004, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2248. A letter from the Comptroller General, Government Accountability Office, transmitting information concerning GAO employees who were assigned to congressional committees during fiscal year 2004, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(b)(1)(C); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2249. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2250. A letter from the Special Trustee for Amerian Indians, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft bill, ''To resolve certain accounting discrepancies within the Individual Indian Money Account Pool and for other puroses''; to the Committee on Resources.

2251. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a copy of the Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States for the March and September 2004 sessions, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 331; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2252. A letter from the Director, Federal Judicial Center, transmitting the Federal Judicial Center's Annual Report for the 2004 calendar year, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 623(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 481. A bill to further the purposes of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site Establishment Act of 2000, with an amendment (Rept. 109–107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 774. A bill to adjust the boundary of Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado (Rept. 109–108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 853. A bill to remove certain restrictions on the Mammoth Community Water District's ability to use certain property acquired by that District from the United States (Rept. 109–109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 873. A bill to provide for a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives to represent the Commonwealth of the Northern Marina Islands, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1084. A bill to authorize the establishment at Antietam National Battlefield of a memorial to the officers and enlisted men of the Fifth, Sixth, and Ninth New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry Regiments and the First New Hampshire Light Artillery Battery who fought in the Battle of Antietam on September 17, 1862, and for other purposes (Rept.